

EN999068

09/668,212

00240064AA

Reply to office action mailed 04/21/2004

REMARKS

Claims 1 - 16 are currently pending in the application. By this amendment, claim 10 is amended for the Examiner's consideration. The foregoing separate sheets marked as "Listing of Claims" shows all the claims in the application, with an indication of the current status of each.

It is noted with appreciation that the drawings filed on September 22, 2000 have been approved. It is also noted that the IDS submitted on September 22, 2000 has been entered by the Examiner.

Claims 10 - 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. This rejection is traversed.

Claim 10 has been amended to make a typographical revision to change the claim dependency from claim 1 to claim 2. Claim 2 specifies the **exiting step** which is recited in claims 10 - 16. With this amendment, there is sufficient antecedent basis for the limitations provided in claims 10 - 16.

Claims 1 - 4 and 6 - 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uppaluru (6,400,806 B1). This rejection is traversed.

Before the specific arguments of the Examiner are address, it is useful to discuss the fundamental differences between Uppaluru and the subject invention. The concept of using voice as an input method for entering data is the basic feature. However, the implementation of the subject is significantly different from that of Uppaluru. That is, Uppaluru requires user profile 'pages' to be generated prior to being able to use voice as an input to Internet based forms as discussed in the paragraph beginning in column 2, line 46. The subject invention does not require any prior use or profile pages to enter data in Internet forms using audio or tactile data entry methods. The subject invention provides the Internet forms such that the forms can be read to the user and that the audio or tactile inputs from the user can be entered into the forms and transmitted back to the Internet. This allows any Internet page to be

EN999068

09/668,212

00240064AA

Reply to office action mailed 04/21/2004

accessed, translated by the method of the subject invention and presented to a user.

Uppaluru does not do this.

Uppaluru not only requires an **up front user profile** to be created before a user can access the capability but it further limits with which pages a user can communicate. Only those pages that have been so modified, or 'tagged' can be accessed by the user as defined in column 2, lines 42 - 45,

“...Each web page in the voice web contains a specially **tagged set of key words** and touch tone sequences that are associated with embedded anchors and links used for navigation within the web.”

These tagged or modified pages are considered to be part of a “voice web” (column 2, lines 39 - 42) which are a subset of the Internet as a whole, thus limiting which pages a user can access.

The subject invention does not require that the user have a user profile page or that the form be associated with a voice web page as does Uppaluru. Therefore, it would not be obvious to move to another field based on the Uppaluru since Uppaluru does not perform similarly to the subject invention.

With respect to claim 2, the subject invention requires,

“...the step of exiting the form **after the user has supplied input** for all required fields..”

This is not the same as for Uppaluru. The Examiner is citing column 10, line 34 - column 11, line 14 to state that the use of voice web forms is the same as the browser forms of claim 2. This is incorrect. Claim 2 does not limit the forms to those specified as voice web forms by Uppaluru.

Furthermore, Uppaluru requires that the user be authenticated prior to being able to access the voice web pages as in column 3, lines 24 - 26 which recites,

“Once authenticated, the user is allowed to navigate and access more information from the voice web using voice commands.”

EN999068

09/668,212

00240064AA

Reply to office action mailed 04/21/2004

Thus, Uppaluru requires a user to be authenticated to access the voice web specific pages. The subject invention does not require authentication, does not limit the user to voice web specific pages, and does not require a user to have a prepared user profile in order to access the Internet and enter data via an audio/tactile method.

With respect to claims 3, 4, 6, 7 and 8, the subject invention does not limit access to specific voice web pages. Furthermore, the subject invention does not require user specific voice patterns in order to meet the requirements of these claims (e.g., claim 3 - **the step of prompting** is performed by reading aloud to the user a heading of a form field to be filled in.

claim 4 - **the step of audibly presenting** to the user any information that is contained in the form field,

claim 5 - **the step of typing** into the form field words responsively spoken by the user.

claim 6 - during the moving step the browser responds to one or more **verbal commands** provided the user

claim 7 - the one or more verbal commands are selected from the group... **skip... review... submit... cancel... clear**, etc.). That is, the subject invention does not require a *suitable subset of training word patterns from the user's profile* as recited in Uppaluru column 3, lines 38 - 39 in order to translate the users audio input.

With respect to claim 8, Uppaluru does not disclose a voice form for guiding the user step by step as in the subject invention. The Examiner cites column 21, lines 7 - 67 to argue that Uppaluru guides the user. However, this reference discusses the prompts as shown in Figure 8 and Figure 9 of Uppaluru. These figures provide guidance only as defined in the "customized query forms using user attributes and preferences 304". That is, Uppaluru can only give guidance using predefined prompts from the user profile and other personal voice web pages. The subject invention is not limited by personal profile or other predefined prompts. Therefore, it is not obvious to provide guidance in a step by step or default order as for the subject invention.

EN999068

09/668,212

00240064AA

Reply to office action mailed 04/21/2004

Regarding claim 9, the Examiner acknowledges that Uppaluru does not teach prompting the user... after a specified time period... as recited in claim 9. Since Uppaluru does not provide the guidance prompts of the subject invention as discussed above for claim 8, it is therefore, not obvious to have specified time periods for these prompts as suggested by the Examiner.

As for claims 10 - 16 which relate to the audio queue, the Examiner argues that the audio queue of the subject invention is the same as the voice strings of Uppaluru. This is incorrect. The voice output of Uppaluru is a predefined set of voice strings created as part of the user profile set up.

Claims 10-16 cover methods in which the audio and visual presentations are being managed. This is discussed in detail in the application at page 12, lines 7 et seq. For example, if a field was not filled in (either verbally or by tactile interaction), the various threads (using the queue) may reprompt the user for the input. If the field was filled out, the queue would progress to the next field, and so on. The subject invention does not use a user profile set up and therefore, the audio queue of the subject invention is not the same as the voice string of Uppaluru

Claim 5 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uppaluru (6,400,806 B1) in view of Goldhor (5,101,375). This rejection is traversed.

Goldhor is concerned with what would amount to control codes in a word processing environment relative to a voice recognition system. That is, Goldhor provides the ability to include capitalizing various letter of a text string generated by a voice recognition function. This does not relate to the subject of claim 5 which recites,

“...typing into the form field words responsively spoken by the user...”

There is no discussion in the subject invention relative to the capitalization of the text which is typed into the forms. As discussed previously, Uppaluru does not provide the same features as the subject invention in that Uppaluru requires a user profile, authentication and limits the web pages to be accessed. Therefore, there is no

EN999068

09/668,212

00240064AA

Reply to office action mailed 04/21/2004

combination of Uppaluru together or separate from Goldhor that would provide the features of the subject invention.

In view of the foregoing, it is requested that the application be reconsidered, that claims 1 - 16 be allowed, and that the application be passed to issue.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at 703-787-9400 (fax: 703-787-7557; email: mike@wcc-ip.com) to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or personal interview.

If an extension of time is required for this response to be considered as being timely filed, a conditional petition is hereby made for such extension of time. Please charge any deficiencies in fees and credit any overpayment of fees to Deposit Account 09-0457 (IBM-Endicott)

Respectfully submitted,



Michael E. Whitham
Reg. No. 32,635

Whitham, Curtis & Christofferson, P.C.
11491 Sunset Hills Road, Suite 340
Reston, VA 20190
703-787-9400
703-787-7557 (fax)

Please associate this
Application with
Customer No. 30743